REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendment and following discussion, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are pending. It is respectfully submitted that the changes do not add new matter as Claims 1-2 and 5-7 were amended only to clarify the claimed subject matter and to correct antecedent basis problems.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Emanuel et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2000/0012328, herein "Emanuel"). In response to the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Emanuel that rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration of the rejection for the reasons below. Claim 1 is directed to a resource allocation control device connected to a radio access network and an IP network.[1] The radio access network has a base transceiver station to which a mobile station is associated and a base station controller.[2] The resource allocation control device includes means for corresponding radio access channels to IP ports without converting data for each transport block.[3] Claim 1 recites in part, "corresponding means for corresponding radio access channels ... and transmission/reception ports[.]"

Emanuel does not disclose corresponding radio access channels to an IP port because Emanuel only discusses corresponding a channel type to an IP port.[4] Channel types are categories of channels such as random access channels or broadcast channels.[5] Claim 1 describes an actual **channel** instead of a channel type. Moreover, the claimed approach saves the processing time that is required by Emanuel due to the processing that takes place at the

---

[1] Specification, par. 7.
[2] *Id.*
[3] Specification, par. 8.
[4] Emanuel, Abstract, par. 18-19, par. 20, "channel type" is used throughout Emanuel.
[5] Emanuel, par. 13.

base station[6] to decode the channel type to a particular channel. In <u>Emanuel</u> the base station has to use the channel type information with the added information of an end user identifier to determine univocally the destination. The claimed subject matter does this port-to-channel correspondence without having to take the added step of channel type to channel translation at the base station.[7]

Therefore, <u>Emanuel</u> fails to disclose every feature recited in Applicants' Claim 1, so that Claims 1 is patentably distinct over the referenced art. Specifically, <u>Emanuel</u> fails to disclose, "corresponding means for corresponding radio access <u>channels</u> ... and transmission/reception ports[.]", as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

As Claims 2-5 depend upon independent Claim 1 and Claim 6-7 cover similar subject matter of Claim 1 although in alternate statutory form, these claims are likewise allowable at least for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendment it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\MS\24s\245422US-AM.DOC

---

[6] <u>Emanuel</u>, par. 22, "... channel detector determining univocally said channel type[.]"
[7] Specification throughout indicates corresponding a channel and not a channel type.